

## Pearl oyster and freshwater mussel training courses in the Philippines

Article by Daisy Ladra and Virginia Luyun, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, 860 Arcadia Building, Quezon Ave., Quezon City, Philippines.

In an effort to develop the pearl resources of the Philippines, pearl production training has been initiated by the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources this year. Pearl is the eighth largest dollar earner of the Philippines. As of 1991, the industry was worth US\$ 36,000,000. The Philippines is able to obtain this amount through export of raw and polished pearl oyster shells, shell buttons and pearls.

The pearl oyster/freshwater mussel training is a basic course designed to develop technical know-how in pearl oyster/freshwater mussel farming and pearl production.

The course runs for a week and covers both theoretical and practical aspects of farm set-up, basic surgical techniques for pearl production, oyster/mussel anatomy and biology, farm operation and maintenance and spat collection. A field trip to a pearl farm is the culminating activity for the course.

The training is also intended to provide the participants with skills which they can immediately apply in their work.

Two courses have been conducted for this year, one for marine pearl and the other for freshwater pearl. The first was held in Zamboanga City under the auspices of Land Bank and the Agricultural Training Institute. The second course, which centred on freshwater pearl production, was held at the Regional Fisherman's Training Center in Tabacco, Albay. Both courses were attended by 18–19 participants coming from the banking sector, private investors and extension workers from the government.

Surgical equipments, shell beads and nets can be manufactured in the country. 

## From whence cometh 'Pinctada'? — The mystery of the etymology of the genus

Mr Andy Muller, of Golay Buchel Japan, K.K., requested information on the precise meaning and the etymological root of Pinctada. Beatrice Burch (Fax: (808) 2646408), of the Bishop Museum in Honolulu kindly did the bloodhound work, and provided the following in reply to Mr Muller:

*I thought that I'd have no trouble in finding out the meaning of Pinctada, but I was wrong. Finally, I phoned the Chairman of the Classic Language Dept. at the University of Hawaii and he said that the word was not Latin or Greek, and certainly wasn't French, but a made-up word.*

*When I told him that it was originally used by Roeding in 1798 for a genus name, he was surprised. I talked also to the modern language teacher who agreed that it had no meaning. How Roeding used it, I've no idea.*

*Linnaeus in the 10th edition of Systema Naturae in 1758 used the genus Mytilus and the species of margaritifera as Neil Sims has said.*

*Gmelin in the 13th edition of the Systema Naturae also used Mytilus margaritifera. He did include more references, but neither he nor Roeding did more than just use*

*the word with no explanation. See Gmelin and Roeding (or Röding).*

*I would suggest that with your interests that you try to obtain a copy of the Ranson 1961 article. It is delightful, full of information. Of course, it is in French.*

*So all I can say is, the authorities that I consulted, including the professors of the various languages at the university, do not think that Pinctada is a real word, nor that it could mean bivalve. Our various dictionaries of Latin, Greek, French, German and Spanish only list Pinna as meaning bivalve.*

*Yes, margaritifera does refer to pearl and pearl forming. You will note that Roeding said under Pinctada, 'Die Perlmutter', or 'mother-of-pearl'. Our New Cassell's German Dictionary has a lot on perl-erl this or that, including perl muschel and perlmutter.*

*So perhaps what Röding was trying to say was that Pinctada margaritifera was a mother-of-pearl (Those pearls from it were rare then, as now, and the mother-of-pearl was more striking than even the pearls formed). Had Röding known of the gorgeous Australian Pinctada maxima, then that would have been as much of a thrill to him as it is to us today.*

*I hope that this rather confusing summary of my last two weeks of looking for Pinctada is satisfying to you. Certainly, I enjoyed it and learned a great deal.*

*By the way, I checked through the Henry Dodge series on 'A Historical Review of the Mollusks of Linnaeus', published as seven parts on gastropods, to see what he said in general about the Gmelin 13th edition of Systema Naturae, Röding etc., and, while not on bivalves, it was interesting in that it had the sort of comments that I'd hoped for.*

*He didn't agree always with Gmelin, thinking it somewhat mixed up, not in just one species, but in several. Too bad this sort of analysis wasn't done for the bivalves. The series is incomplete due to the failure of the author's eyesight. Consequently there are just seven parts to this series put out by the Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History in the 1950s. I guess the closest thing that we can have is just the listing in the Ranson article.*

*You can see from the Ranson article that he tried to be very thorough with locating literature and specimens of pearl oysters. He, by the way, has P. fucata, P. fucata martensi, P. radiata, etc. But he places P. galtstoffs under P. margaritifera, whereas Shirai maintains it as a separate species. Shirai in his new identification manual puts P. radiata, P. fucata and P. fucata martensii under imbricata and doesn't give any reasons for that lumping.*

